

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing amendments and reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended to more specifically set forth the invention. ~~Claim 3 has been canceled, as it now is included~~ in claim 1. The preambles of claims 13-15 have been amended to correspond with claim 12. Claims 1, 2, and 4-15 remain in the application.

Claim 1 has been amended to rectify the language pointed out by the Examiner. Also, claims 13-15 have been amended so that the preambles correspond to the preamble of claim 12. Further, all of the claims have been amended to be directed to the invention originally claimed in claims 2, 8, and 12. The amendments to the claims do not introduce any new issues, as can be seen by referring to claim 12, for example. Everything presently in the claims was included in the claims originally. Therefore, no new searching or changes in arguments are required by the present amendments.

Claims 1-5, 7-10, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Henson et al. (U.S.P. 5,940,562). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

All of the claims now include language that specifies vias extending through the base, with at least one of the vias grounded, so as to form a transmission line. As pointed out in the specification, (see for example the paragraph beginning at the bottom of page 14 and continuing at the top of page 16), transmission lines provide substantial advantages over connections disclosed in the prior art. Nothing in the disclosure of Henson et al. in any way suggests to one skilled in the art vias positioned to form a transmission line connecting components within the package to circuitry outside the package. Therefore, none of the claims 1-5, 7-10, and 12-14 read on Henson et al. and Henson et al. do not anticipate these claims.

Claims 6, 11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Henson et al. (U.S.P. 5,940,562) in view of Edwards et al. (Pub. No.: US 2003/0103740 A1). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

All of the claims now include language that specifies vias extending through the base, with at least one of the vias grounded, so as to form a transmission line. Nothing in the disclosures of Henson et al. or Edwards et al. in any

way suggests to one skilled in the art vias positioned to form a transmission line connecting components within the package to circuitry outside the package. Therefore, the claims 6, 11, and 15 are not obvious in view of any combination of Henson et al. and Edwards et al.

SUMMARY

Since none of the applied references disclose apparatus similar to applicant's claimed structure and since none of the applied references can achieve the functions of the present invention, applicant believes that claims 1, 2, and 4-15 are in condition for allowance.

Should there be any questions or remaining issues regarding the foregoing, Examiner is cordially invited to telephone the undersigned attorney for a speedy resolution.

Respectfully requested,



Robert A. Parsons
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 32,713

31 October 2003
340 East Palm Lane, Suite 260
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
(602) 252-7494